


# Lodestar

No. 17 Winter 1990/91



£1.20

## Contents

**PETER WALLIS**

**Jorian Jenks: A Keeper of the Agrarian Tradition**

### BOOKS

**JOHN STEELE**

on Other Losses  
by James Bacque

**GEOFFREY VERNON** on A European Diary  
by Diana Mosley

**JEFFREY HAMM**

on Blackshirts and Roses  
by John Charnley

### IN BRIEF:

**The Work of Colin Wilson by Colin Stanley**

**An Essay on the Meaning of English Nationhood**  
by Stuart Millson

### LETTER

**The Path to Europe**





## LODESTAR

Editor : Geoffrey Vernon  
Associate Editor : Peter Wallis  
Editorial Offices : Nash House,  
Fishponds Road,  
London SW17  
Tel: 081-767 7076

### JORIAN JENKS: A KEEPER OF THE AGRARIAN TRADITION

by Peter Wallis

IN spite of the current concern with environmental matters the pioneers of the Organic Movement are largely forgotten. In part this may be political. Many of them tended to be "reactionary" or even worse. The editor of a recent anthology of their writings, **The Organic Tradition** (Green Classics, 1988), hints at "a sympathy for Nazism" among some. Hardly the image the modern "Greens" would wish to promote. Indeed the reviewer of that anthology in the Soil Association's journal **Living Earth** (Jan-March 1989) was moved to the admission that "the first editor of the Soil Association's journal . . . was a Fascist and was in custody during the war." He does not name him, thinking, no doubt, that decent oblivion was the most suitable fate for such a character. Well, his name was Jorian Jenks and he deserves to be better known.

\* \* \* \*

Jorian Edward Forwood Jenks was born in 1899 at Oxford where his father, Edward Jenks, was at that time Reader in English Law. His mother, Dorothy Mary Jenks née Forwood, was his father's second wife, the first having died in Australia in 1891 shortly after giving birth to a son. Edward Jenks had qualified as a solicitor before going up to Kings College, Cambridge to read Law and History and concurrently to read for the Bar to which he was called in 1887. He subsequently held professorships and senior academic posts at Cambridge, Melbourne, Liverpool, Oxford and London and was the author of several distinguished books on law and constitutional history. His son claimed to be prouder of his skill as a ploughman and stockman than of any literary or scientific attainments but in fact Jorian Jenks was not without formal academic achievement. He was educated at Haileybury, a Public School in Hertfordshire, but left at the age of sixteen after passing his matriculation examination. In 1916 he entered Harper Adams Agricultural College in Shropshire but his course was interrupted



by war service in the Royal Horse Artillery. Returning to his studies in January 1919, he gained his National Diploma in Agriculture in 1920.

A short period as a farm manager in Berkshire followed but he was soon the victim of the deflationary economic conditions of the time and in 1922 he emigrated to New Zealand. For a year he worked on the farm of a family friend and then joined the New Zealand Department of Agriculture, working as a lecturer and advisor in Auckland Province. After extended home leave, studying farming conditions in Australia and Canada on the way, he returned to Government service in New Zealand to undertake special duties under the 1925 Deteriorated Lands Act where he obtained first-hand experience of the effects of soil erosion and loss of fertility. In 1928, as the result of a legacy, he decided to return home and continue his education.

He matriculated at Balliol College, Oxford in the Michaelmas term 1928 and did two years research at the Institute of Agricultural Economics (now incorporated in Queen Elizabeth House). He prepared a dissertation on land settlement in the Empire for which he was awarded The Diploma in Rural Studies and followed this with a thesis, "The Evolution of Modern Land Settlement Policy in Australia and New Zealand", for which he received the research degree of Bachelor of Letters (B. Litt.) in 1930.

There followed a year spent as an agricultural district lecturer in East Devon, employed by Devon County Council, before he achieved his life ambition to farm on his own account. While employed by Devon County Council he married an Australian girl, Sophie Isobel Chester. The wedding took place on 23rd June, 1931 at St. David's parish church, Exeter. There were two children, a son and a daughter, of the marriage which was to end in divorce in November 1951.

\*     \*     \*     \*

To understand Jenks' political activity in the 1930s it is necessary to go back to 1846. The repeal of the Corn Laws, designed to provide cheap food for an increasing industrial proletariat, marked the start of the long decline of British agriculture. The immediate agricultural depression caused by the repeal was short-lived as the international situation in mid-century with the Crimean war and later the American Civil War prevented the development of a major crisis. However, the last quarter of the century which saw the opening up of 'virgin' lands in North and South America and in Australasia, coupled with technological development which drastically reduced transport costs, saw the final destruction of British agriculture as a major occupation and the country, no longer able to supply all its own food, became increasingly dependant on imports. When the nineteenth century opened



almost a third of the national income was provided by agriculture which sustained over a third of the country's population. By the end of the century only 6% of national income came from an agriculture which employed 9% of the national labour force. The type of farming changed too as cereal production increasingly gave way to pastoral farming.

During the 1914-18 war necessity gave temporary support to British agriculture and it was originally intended to make permanent a level of support for home produce. This was embodied in the 1920 Agriculture Act. Almost before the ink was dry it became clear that the fall in agricultural prices in 1920 and 1921 would bring into operation in the Autumn of 1921 the guaranteed minimum prices for wheat and oats embodied in the Act. The Government decided that the estimated cost (£30m.) was unacceptable and announced the immediate repeal of those sections of the Act which contained the guarantee clauses without giving the four years notice which the Act required, thus demolishing the intended firm basis for post-war agricultural policy. So between the wars several million acres were lost to agriculture and the price fluctuations of the twenties followed by the effects of the slump in the early thirties further weakened British agriculture and impoverished its practitioners.

This was the situation when Jorian Jenks took over as tenant of a mixed farm at Amering, Sussex. It is not entirely surprising that he, like many others engaged in agriculture, was attracted to the only political organisation which was at that time wholeheartedly supporting the cause of home agriculture, Sir Oswald Mosley's **British Union of Fascists** (later to become the **British Union of Fascists and National Socialists** and known simply as **British Union**, by which name it will be referred to for convenience in the rest of this essay). Fascist policy was unashamedly protectionist and aimed not only to develop British agriculture to provide the greatest possible self sufficiency but also to arrest and reverse the rural decline which had followed the drift from the land. In short, **British Union** wanted to reverse the effects of the repeal of the Corn Laws.

Although this agricultural policy was obviously the main motive for Jenks' political commitment he nevertheless became ideologically committed as well. He also developed admiration for and loyalty to Mosley whom he saw, slightly improbably, as a latter-day Cobbett. From the mid-thirties he was a regular contributor on agricultural topics to **British Union** publications, writing articles in **Action**, first under the pen-name 'Virgilius' and later contributing a weekly column 'The British Countryside' under his own name. He also wrote on agriculture and country topics for the **Fascist Quarterly** and its successor the **British Union Quarterly**.



Jenks was becoming a prominent figure in **British Union**. In 1936 he was adopted as its Prospective Parliamentary Candidate for Horsham and Worthing, the constituency in which he lived. He also became the Movement's official Agricultural Adviser and he drafted its new agricultural policy statement, **The Land and the People**. The main theme was the ability of Britain to feed itself, given proper development of its agriculture.

"Our land and our climate are still among the best in the world," he wrote; "our agriculturalists of all classes rank equally high; and we can yet show some excellent examples of intensive farming. The blight which hangs over the countryside is the blight of persistent and deliberate neglect on the part of those responsible for our economic policy. No nation has greater need for a productive agriculture; no nation has made less effort to achieve it."

By now he had become concerned with more than just agricultural matters and in 1939 he set out his political commitment in a short book, **Spring Comes Again**. A critical look at the economic philosophies of the day led him to reject the orthodoxies of socialism and liberalism in favour of the search for a system which would provide man with "the full expression of his creative personality". At the time he found a satisfactory answer in the policies of **British Union**: personal leadership; team work through a corporatist system comprising employer, employee, producer, trader and consumer; national independence based on an Imperial system insulated from the fluctuations of world trade; and strict control of finance by Government.

In spite of its obvious propagandist intention **Spring Comes Again** was more than just a fascist tract. It was also a serious attempt to state an organic political and economic philosophy. "Before economics can be more than a set of conventional formulae" he wrote, "it must view man as a **whole**, as a producer who produces, not only in order to consume, but in order to find an outlet for his creative instincts." The concept of "wholeness" is a common one among the pioneers of organic thought and there are hints here of the ideas that Jenks was to work out in his post-war writings.

Jenks gave up his farm in 1939, partly as a result of the agricultural depression and partly because of health problems. He moved to Forest Row, Sussex where he continued to breed pigs. His headed notepaper of the time describes him as "Agricultural Correspondent and Consultant" and "Breeder of Tuberculin-tested Pigs". He had a fondness for pigs which he considered the second most intelligent animals after, though a long way after, dogs.



In September of that year Britain declared war on Germany who had invaded Poland, the integrity of which had been guaranteed by the British government a few months previously. Mosley opposed the declaration of war against Germany on the grounds that no British interest was involved in Eastern Europe, that war with Germany endangered the security of the British Empire which was not directly threatened by German actions and that the likely outcome of the defeat of Germany would be the advance of Soviet Communism into Europe. It was not a view which commanded widespread support at the time or since but recently some independently minded historians have concluded that it was a mistake to have declared war to maintain the boundaries of Poland as set up by the Treaty of Versailles, notably Maurice Cowling, Fellow of Peterhouse, Cambridge and author of **The Impact of Hitler** (Cambridge University Press 1975) and John Charmley who, in his book **Chamberlain and the Lost Peace** (Hodder and Stoughton 1989), commented on "Mosley's sensible ideas on foreign policy".

In any case, whatever the merits or otherwise of Mosley's views on the war, political opposition to particular wars has a long history among British statesmen.

In the eighteenth century Chatham opposed the war with the American colonies; Charles James Fox opposed the war against Napoleon; Lloyd George opposed the Boer War; and a number of prominent figures, including the future Labour Prime Minister Ramsay Macdonald, campaigned for a negotiated peace during the First World War.

Once Poland had been subjugated (by the Soviet Union from the east as well as by Germany from the west it should be remembered) the war settled down to a position of stalemate. During this "Phoney War" period Mosley and **British Union** campaigned for a negotiated peace with Germany. Jenks continued to write on food and agriculture for **Action** right up to the time it was suppressed in May, 1940. A few weeks later in early June, along with some 700 other prominent Mosley supporters, Jenks was arrested and he was to spend nearly eighteen months in detention in a succession of camps and prisons including Ascot, Huyton near Liverpool, Peel on the Isle of Man and finally Brixton, prior to being released towards the end of 1941.

Lest it be thought that his detention indicated some discreditable or even disloyal activities it should be pointed out that today no impartial investigator would be likely to find the imprisonment of hundreds of British citizens without trial or any charges being preferred against them in any way justified, even given the national emergency. The collapse of the British and French armies in the face of the German **blitzkrieg** and the apparent imminence of an invasion, which we now



know that Hitler never seriously intended at that time, led to a hysterical press campaign against imagined "fifth columnists" and the new all-party Coalition government took the opportunity to silence Mosley and, in the case of the Labour members, pay off old scores dating back to Mosley's defection from the Labour Party in 1930. The whole sorry story of what he terms "an aberration in the tradition of the English legal system" can be read in detail in Richard Thurlow's **Fascism in Britain** (Blackwell 1987). His conclusion was that while, in his view, British fascists may have been politically naive, "the vast majority of them, like Mosley, were patriots not potential traitors." (Page 302).

Internment was something of a lottery with some prominent figures escaping and some insignificant fascists being arrested. There seems to have been no criteria for deciding who was to be held. It is not known why Jenks was one of those picked for internment apart from his prominence in **British Union**. The files of those detained under Defence Regulation 18B have for the most part been "lost" we are told and of those remaining only a handful are available for public scrutiny. It seems strange that such a large proportion of the documents relating to one subject, and a controversial one at that, should have gone missing. Thurlow believes that they are not available because they would show the illegal activities of MI5 in attempting to produce evidence in favour of internment. It seems equally likely that they could not be made public because they would show the flimsiness of the so-called evidence used to put in prison without trial people who neither had committed, nor were likely to commit, any crime other than that of holding unpopular opinions about the war. It was certainly not British Justice's "finest hour".

Be that as it may neither Jenks' file, whether lost or not, nor any of the Defence Regulation 18B Advisory Committee documents relating to him are available. An enquiry at the Public Record Office (November 1988) elicited the response that "since these files are of a sensitive nature and many subject to extended closures it would appear that the files relating to Jorian Edward Forwood Jenks are not yet available for public inspection."

\* \* \* \*

Life was not easy for an ex-18B detainee. After his release Jenks at first stayed with his cousin Miles Campbell Main at his farm at Forest Row, Sussex and then moved to his late father's house at Bishops Tawton, near Barnstaple, Devon where his mother continued to live and where he was to remain mostly for the rest of the war. Work was not easy to come by but he did eventually find some outlets for his writing although it was not until 1946 that the position started to improve. By then he had acquired several part-time appointments,



most notably for the **Rural Reconstruction Association**, the newly formed **Soil Association** and the **Council for Church and Countryside** of which he was Secretary.

**The Soil Association** was to become the most important of Jenks' new interests and will be dealt with later, but at this time he was very much involved in the **Rural Reconstruction Association**. This had been founded in 1926 by Montague Fordham (1864-1948), writer and lecturer on rural problems and the author of numerous books on rural matters. Its aim was "the restoration of agriculture to its rightful place in our national life". One of its main policy planks was agricultural price support and it attributed the Wheat Act 1932, which for the first time since 1921 provided a measure of support for British agriculture, to its activities. Jenks became editor of the Association's journal **Rural Economy**, a post he held for ten years, and was active on its Research Committee, along with Robert Saunders and another **British Union** veteran, Derek Stuckey.

Ironically, the war which he had so passionately opposed and which had landed him in prison had given the required boost to British agriculture as once again harsh necessity demanded the maximisation of home production. The question was: would history repeat itself and, with the immediate crisis over, would we see withdrawal of price support, as in 1921, destroy the hard work of the war years? In the immediate event bankrupt Britain could not afford to buy food abroad and the war-torn world was under-producing, not over-producing, food. Food rationing in Britain was actually intensified after the war had ended.

However, there was no lack of influential voices preaching the old gospel of free trade when conditions returned to 'normal', Geoffrey Crowther, editor of **The Economist**, for example. In a paper read to the Farmers Club (12.3.1945) he put the orthodox view:

"Now clearly, with the familiar exceptions of milk and potatoes and some forms of vegetables, the most economic way of getting food for this country has always been, and still is, to buy it from abroad. One man-hour of British labour, when applied in manufacture and the products exchanged for Canadian or Argentine wheat, will produce more wheat than if it is expended in British agriculture—I would maintain without any hesitation or doubt that British prosperity is founded more than on any other single factor on the fact that our industrial population has been able to get its food, and our industries their raw material, more cheaply than other industrial countries."

Jenks set out the opposing case in a pamphlet written for the Association, **The Case for the Full Development of Agriculture** (1948).



In it he argued, as he had in pre-war days and as he was to continue to do, that Britain's unique combination of climate, fertile soil and human skills made it possible, given the political will, for this country to be self-supporting in basic foods. This was not just desirable on economic or even strategic grounds. It was essential to the well-being of our civilisation:

"But agriculture, the only means by which populous communities can feed themselves, is much more than an insurance against hunger and war. It is the basic culture of civilisation, the art by which men cultivate their natural environment and are in turn cultivated by it. A vigorous rural element is as indispensable to a human community as is a fertile soil; no empire, however proud, has ever been able to survive the neglect or abuse of either.

"Western civilisation today appears to be centred on its great cities; and it is of course true that these are the focal points of human intercourse. But it is only modern transport that has given the city a semblance of self-sufficiency; in fact it is as dependant as ever upon the countryside to feed and clothe it, to renew its population, and to provide it with the means of physical and mental recreation. Just as the land is the chief primary source of wealth, so is agriculture the foundation of the whole social economy."

Jenks' skilful pen was much in demand by the **Rural Reconstruction Association**. Singlehanded he produced a first draft of 40,000 words for its Research Committee in an attempt to answer the question "Can Britain be self-supporting in food?" This became the basis of the Committee's published report **Feeding The Fifty Million** (Hollis and Carter, 1955). The report was thorough in its considerations but somewhat inconclusive in its recommendations. Possibly this is inevitable in the work of a committee whose members often had conflicting viewpoints. A notable example was the discussion of soil fertility (p. 55-58) which left the Committee deeply divided on the issue of 'chemical' versus 'organic' husbandry and resulted in no conclusions at all, only recording the arguments of each school of thought. As pointed out in the **Preface** by Committee Chairman A. E. G. Hawkins and Secretary D. R. Stuckey, there was no claim to produce final answers. It is in any case only of historical interest. The data on which it was based and the conditions to which it refers have long been out of date, especially since the adherence of the United Kingdom to the Treaty of Rome and its Common Agricultural Policy.

The **Rural Reconstruction Association** eventually faded away as interest in rural revival decreased in an increasingly suburbanised Britain. On the other hand British agriculture continued to receive a measure of support that it had not known for over a century, except in wartime. But it was large-scale farming that now flourished. Farming



had truly become an 'industry' and the pension funds and insurance companies invested their money and drove up the price of agricultural land. It was to be a different world from that of the 'homestead economy' which Jenks saw as the basis for rural revival.

\* \* \* \*

In 1948 Sir Oswald Mosley had re-formed his political movement, now named **Union Movement**. In place of the pre-war nationalism and a policy of imperial development, no longer an option for a drastically weakened Britain in a world increasingly dominated by the United States of America and the Soviet Union, the new movement advocated European Union and the joint development by the European powers of the African continent, still at that time largely under colonial rule. Jenks did not join the new movement. He was unenthusiastic about European unity and sceptical of the scope for development in Africa, especially agricultural development. Many of Jenks' former colleagues were similarly sceptical about his new enthusiasm for organic husbandry. Nevertheless, he was invited, and agreed, to assist the **Union Movement Agricultural Council** in preparing its policy statement. As with the **Rural Reconstruction Association** report he undertook the major part of the drafting work, something which was not entirely to the liking of Raven Thomson, Secretary of the movement and Editor of its journal **Union**, who feared that Jenks might impose his own views on the document.

In the event the published pamphlet, **None Need Starve** (August 1952) probably owed more to Jenks in style than in content. A comparison with an earlier policy statement, **Union Movement Food and Farming Policy** (1950), does not show any basic change of policy, which remained maximum development of British agriculture, co-operation with the rest of Europe and African development but it is perhaps significant that the possibilities for African development are given a shorter and less enthusiastic mention in **None Need Starve** than in the much briefer earlier pamphlet. Jenks' influence can also probably be discerned in the eloquent section on soil fertility and in the proposals for large-scale experiments in organic farming and the requirements on local authorities to engage in the systematic composting of all organic wastes.

In spite of this Jenks' influence on the post-war Mosley movement was slight. He had never reneged on his pre-war political views but he was unable to fully accept the post-war development of Mosley's policies. He never became involved in the Movement's general activities nor, apart from two articles in Mosley's monthly journal **The European**, did he write for its papers. In any case, his position as Editorial Secretary of the **Soil Association**, a post which he had held since its formation, would have precluded any open political commitment.

\* \* \* \*



**The Soil Association** was formed in 1946, bringing together for the first time in a single organisation people of many backgrounds and experience—agricultural, medical, scientific as well as those simply concerned with a healthy diet—who were involved in what can loosely be called ‘the organic movement’. The inspiration behind the formation of the Association was Lady Eve Balfour’s book **The Living Soil**, first published in 1943 by Faber and Faber. In it she explored the link between health, food and the soil in which it is grown and came to the conclusion that study of particularly healthy groups of people throughout the world showed that the common factor was ‘whole’ diet in which every edible part of the food was consumed and that all organic wastes were returned to the soil in which the food was produced.

The book attracted considerable attention and generated such a volume of correspondence that Lady Eve felt the need for a formal organisation. A meeting was held in November 1946 of those who had appeared interested in this idea and from that meeting **The Soil Association** was founded. Jenks was a founder member of the Association and was appointed Editorial Secretary to the Board of the Association’s journal **Mother Earth** which he edited from its foundation in 1946 until his death. Although only quarterly the magazine involved him in a heavy workload of both editing and writing. In all he edited 68 issues and was at work on the 69th at the time of his death.

\*     \*     \*     \*

However, despite his main pre-occupation with the organic movement, Jenks did not entirely neglect wider political matters. As with his pre-war politics his interests had an agricultural base. In her book **Ecology in the Twentieth Century** (Yale University Press 1989) Anna Bramwell writes of “Jenks’ shift from a belief in totalitarian teamwork to a post-war belief in the small individual farmer.” (Page 168) This is an over-simplification. **British Union** had always supported the small farmer and it was a specific point of its agricultural policy to increase the number of small family farms:

“... there must also be a special effort to increase and encourage that singularly valuable class of agriculturalist, namely the yeoman or small working farmer, tilling his own land with the aid of his family.” (**The Land and the People**, page 8).

This was exactly the policy that Jenks set out in detail in his long post-war essay **The Homestead Economy** published in a collection of essays **The Small Farmer** edited by H. J. Massingham (Collins 1947). Moreover he was not preaching unbridled individualism in this essay:

“Most plans for improving the lot of small producers involve a large measure of co-operation amongst them. There is indeed no great



difficulty in demonstrating—on paper at least—that by combining for such purposes as marketing, the purchase of requirements, the use of machinery, technical improvements and so on, they can obtain most of the advantages ascribed to large-scale production without losing altogether their economic independence.”

There is probably not as much shift in his thinking in the change from “team-work” to “co-operation” as Anna Bramwell suggests. Jenks’ case for the small agricultural producer was based on the need for this country to be self-sufficient in basic foods and to halt the rural decline which had accompanied the decay of our agriculture. This meant putting as many people as possible back on the land. Large scale mechanised farming, using the minimum of workers, would do nothing to reverse the decline of rural communities. He was right, of course. Today we have a flourishing, successful agriculture based on the latest mechanised techniques set in the midst of a countryside consisting of urban commuters, the retired, week-end cottages or mostly empty holiday homes, while shops, pubs, post offices, schools and even churches have either vanished or are seriously threatened through lack of a balanced community to support them. Jenks believed that given the political will for rural resettlement and the introduction of co-operative principles for the supply of credit, the acquisition or hiring of equipment and transport and for marketing the small farmer could be viable and could play a vital rôle in developing Britain’s self-sufficiency in basic foods.

For this to happen would require a basic change in economic thinking. The peasant agriculture which had been destroyed first by enclosures in the eighteenth century and then by Free Trade in the nineteenth had been mostly subsistence agriculture. It was replaced by commercial agriculture subject to the same economic criteria as manufacturing industry. By the mid-nineteenth century a highly successful commercial British agriculture was based on the wage-labour-rent mechanism of capitalism. When improved methods of transport led to the opening up of the ‘virgin’ lands of the Americas and Australasia it became cheaper to import food and pay for it by exports of manufactured goods. As long as Britain remained the leading manufacturing nation this seemed to work to our advantage. Unfortunately by the end of the nineteenth century Britain had already lost its manufacturing monopoly so that the theoretical advantage of concentrating on manufacturing and trade while allowing agriculture to decline was no longer valid. From the long-term point of view there were dangerous consequences of this division of the world into manufacturing nations and primary producers seeking equilibrium through international trade. The over-intensive development of agriculture in the new lands to feed the increasing proletariat of the industrial nations led to a permanent loss of fertility over large areas of the world. As Jenks comments:



“What happened in effect was that within the space of a man’s lifetime (say from 1865 to 1930) the greater part of the capital reserves of soil fertility at the disposal of mankind were brought into use—and treated as income.” (**The Homestead Economy**, page 161).

In his essay Jenks sketched the causes and the consequences of this false economic thinking in the context of his plea for the return of the yeoman farmer. He developed his analysis in greater detail in what is undoubtedly his most important book, **From the Ground Up** (Hollis and Carter, 1950), subtitled “An Outline of Real Economy”.

For Jenks, Western society had developed in the wrong direction. When nomadic man learnt the arts of cultivation and became settled he created the conditions of civilisation. The nomad took what he required from his environment and when it was exhausted, moved on. The civilised man tended his environment and made it fruitful. Industrial man returned to the habits of his nomadic ancestors, exhausting the unrenovable natural resources of the earth as well as its fertility, which with care could have been renewed, in the interests of short-term gain. And when one area was exhausted he moved on. Thus were the ‘virgin lands’ opened up and in many cases destroyed in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The change in social philosophy which accompanied the industrial revolution destroyed the organic ties within the community and led to a view of society as no more than a self-regulating mechanism and to the development of political and economic individualism. Jenks described how this philosophy of liberalism was responsible for the replacement of the craftsman by industrial mass production, the industrialisation of agriculture at the expense of the peasant and yeoman farmer, the depopulation of the countryside and the growth of the great urban centres, and ultimately for the destruction of British agriculture as Britain became an industrial and trading nation dependent on imported food supplies from the newly colonised parts of the globe whose fragile fertility was destroyed to feed the urban masses.

Jenks believed that the conditions which had created Britain’s industrial wealth had been temporary ones and that they would not recur. At the time he was writing, shortly after the Second World War, there were few ‘virgin lands’ left and industrialised Europe was in ruins. Impoverished Britain, lacking the resources to maintain itself as the industrial power it had traditionally been, was forced to restrict home consumption of food and goods in a desperate attempt to “export or die”. Seeking an alternative to mechanical society and industrialised living Jenks believed that what was needed was an adaptation of pre-industrial practices. Jenks proposed the restoration of agriculture as a main activity and the recolonisation of the depopulated rural areas through occupations ancillary to agriculture; the acknowledgement of the inter-dependence of town and country and recognition that large



urban conglomerations were an aberration; the development of localised economics, eliminating the wasteful need for transport and middle-men; the development of soil fertility through the return of waste products to the land; the subordination of machines to the requirements of human creativity; above all the search for an ecological balance in which humanity was a partner in nature and not simply a predator upon it. In this way, he believed, Britain could develop a large measure of self-sufficiency and create a healthier and more balanced society.

\* \* \* \*

In 1959 Jenks published one further book, the product of several years hard work and serious reflection. **The Stuff Man's Made of** (Faber and Faber) was subtitled "The Positive Approach to Health Through Nutrition". He had touched on the connection between health and nutrition in **From The Ground Up** and in his new book he undertook a comprehensive study of the relationship between fertile soil and human health. Many of its arguments about the dangers of the increasing trend of using chemical fertilisers and insecticides, on the value of "whole" foods, on the chain of being from the soil to the cell and on the problems of humanity out of step with Nature will be familiar to present day readers. They were not so familiar in 1959.

The declared aim of the book was "an attempt to meet the need for a straightforward account of what has become known as the organic movement". Its argument is that health is a positive matter influenced by food and environment. There is a nutritional cycle comprising soil, plants, animals and human beings, the impairment of which will have a detrimental effect on human health and that the basis of positive health is wholesome food raised from organically fertile soil. Underlying his argument is the concept of "wholeness"; order and interdependence in Nature as opposed to fragmentation and competition; the part not greater than the whole.

He willingly admitted that as a working farmer he had not taken any interest in organic husbandry:

"... indeed, such references to it as I encountered struck me, as they must have struck many other farmers then and since, as being somewhat irrelevant to the pressing problems of earning a living. It has never been easy for the working farmer with unpaid bills on his desk to think in terms of anything but economics."

Nevertheless, he had become convinced by the evidence he had studied of the case for a return to traditional systems of farming which pre-dated the industrialisation of agriculture and the modern emphasis on technology rather than husbandry. It also fitted best with the philosophical views he had developed about humanity, its needs and its place in Nature. Of those who had influenced his later thinking he wrote:



"The three men who did most to shape my present outlook were the late Montague Fordham, an authority on rural history and founder of the Rural Reconstruction Association; the late H. J. (John) Massingham, author of many fascinating books on the countryside; and Laurence Easterbrook, agricultural correspondent of the **News Chronicle** and now a farmer in his own right. Fordham was that rare bird, an original thinker who could readily impart his ideas to others. Massingham shared my deep love of rural England, but had ten times my knowledge and insight. Easterbrook shares my belief that agriculture is one of Britain's most valuable assets, but has ten times my ability to present the facts to the public."

Jenks' final years were spent at Four Marks near Alton, Hampshire where he cultivated an organic small-holding and continued his editorial work for the **Soil Association** as well as other journalism. In May 1960 he married for a second time, a divorcee Elizabeth Howard, but the marriage was not a success and they separated in 1961.

His end was sudden but he left his small-holding in good order and an issue of **Mother Earth** almost ready for the printer. He had suffered from poor health for many years, apparently the result of a severe allergic condition which manifested itself as asthma and as a serious dermatitic condition of the hands. A particularly severe bout of asthma induced a heart attack and he died on 20th August, 1963 at the regrettably early age of 64.

---

(This essay has been abridged from an unpublished study of Jorian Jenks. Those who provided assistance for the original study are too numerous to mention here but special acknowledgement must be made to Robert Saunders, O.B.E., whose political papers proved invaluable; to the Librarian and staff of Sheffield University where the papers are lodged; and to Robert Row of Sanctuary Press and Jeffrey Wallder who provided help with published material).

**About the author:** Peter Wallis, Associate Editor of **Lodestar**, worked for twenty years in local government finance and administration, his final post being Finance Officer, South Bank Concert Halls. His career came to an untimely end during the politically-motivated administrative upheaval at the Halls which preceded the abolition of the Greater London Council.

He now lives in Devon, where he deals in second-hand books and cultivates his (organic) garden. He is a member of the Soil Association, Friends of the Earth and the Henry Williamson Society.



## BOOKS

### MORE GENOCIDE

**Other Losses**, James Bacque, Macdonald (£14.50 inclusive of packing and postage from Steven Books, 10 Lincoln Way, Enfield, Middx.).

BRITAIN declared war on Germany on September 3rd, 1939, and it was a religious war from the first day. British democracy had challenged "the forces of evil". Britain had "guaranteed" the Polish borders against the evil forces. The Prime Minister could not defend them of course; he was unable to fight in Eastern Europe and he sent not a man, ship or plane to defend Poland. But Mr. Chamberlain had said he would stand by Poland. That was the important thing and it should have been enough to deter the evil forces.

It did not, and Poland was defeated. The war which began with bellicose speeches then settled down into the "phoney war" with Britain only half-prepared to fight even in France. But it was still a religious war. Then suddenly the Germans overran Norway, the Low Countries and France in the spring of 1940. The British withdrew from Dunkirk to fight another day and Mr. Chamberlain fell from power. Mr. Churchill took up his banner, saying it was our sacred duty to continue the war against the evil forces. But even he had to wait until a third crusader took the field before the war could be won.

\* \* \* \*

THIS was the American President. Mr. Roosevelt won the war by mobilising American industry. At the same time he gave it wider and grander horizons. When Mr. Churchill met Mr. Roosevelt in Newfoundland in August 1941, America was still a neutral country but Mr. Roosevelt behaved as if he were already at war. Arrayed in the spotless robes of principle he gave it a new and lofty moral tone. Thus from Newfoundland came forth the Atlantic Charter, a resounding document as high-minded as the American declaration of independence. When "fascist slavery" had been cast down every man, woman and child in the world would be free to enjoy peace, prosperity and the pursuit of happiness. It was now emphatically a religious war!

This gave the key-note of all Allied war declarations, breathing the spirit of America the Beautiful, the greatest democracy on earth, and it was not surprising that in 1945 the great majority of German troops preferred to surrender to the splendid Americans than to the murdering, pillaging and raping Red Army. This book shows what happened to some of them.

Ever since the Nuremberg Trial in 1946 we have been deluged and re-deluged with German war crimes and wickedness. There is a vast



literature on the Holocaust alone. America has a huge industry continually re-arranging, re-packaging and re-publishing "the horrors of Nazi Germany" as if nothing had been written on the subject before. It goes on and on. Now we have this appalling book, showing how these splendid Americans (assisted in some cases by the French Army) set up "death camps" in defeated Germany as monstrous as Buchenwald or Dachau. It puts forward strong evidence that a million German prisoners-of-war were starved or worked to death, and on the orders of General Dwight Eisenhower, the laughing and loveable "Ike" so popular in war-time Britain.

\* \* \* \*

THE book opens with the dinner given during the Teheran conference in 1943 where Stalin said he wanted to shoot 50,000 German officers after the war. Churchill was violently angry at this and "Franklin Roosevelt, seeing animosity rise between these two former enemies, fatuously suggested a compromise of 49,000 prisoners to be shot". His son Elliott, a brigadier-general in the U.S. Army, was not satisfied. He proposed the deaths "not only of those fifty thousands . . . but many hundreds of thousands more Nazis as well".

Churchill stormed out here, but Stalin soothed him down. "The dictator was charming. It was all a joke, he explained. We weren't serious. Come back in". But it was no joke, for this was exactly what the U.S. Army carried out in 1945 in the American zone of occupation in Germany, says Mr. Bacque, and the man responsible was Eisenhower. "Eisenhower hated Germans, he told his wife Mamie in a letter in September 1944. Why? 'Because the German is a beast'. In front of the British ambassador to Washington, in August, he said that all of the 3,500 officers of the German General Staff should be 'exterminated'. He would include all leaders of the Nazi party from mayors on up, plus all members of the Gestapo. This would total about 109,000 people . . .'. All to be liquidated, Stalin-style, by the splendid Americans.

What Eisenhower proposed, and later implemented, was the crime of genocide proclaimed in the Nuremberg Judgement of 1946 as one of the great crimes against humanity.

But he was not the only American with genocidal thoughts in 1944. When the British and American leaders met at Quebec to discuss what to do with Germany after the war, Henry Morgenthau, secretary of the U.S. Treasury, had a plan for Germany. It was a plan, says Mr. Bacque, for "pastoralisation" through "the destruction of her industry and mining. The most advanced of the industrialised nations of the world would be turned into one huge farm. There would be massive starvation if the industrial base were destroyed. According to Cordell Hull, 'the Morgenthau Plan would wipe out everything in Germany



except land, and the Germans would have to live on the land. This meant that only 60 per cent of the German population could support themselves on German land and the other 40 per cent would die'. Hull is speaking here of the deaths of about 20 million German civilians".

Had it been carried out the Morgenthau Plan would have ranked with Stalin's greatest crime, the liquidation of the Ukrainian peasantry in the 1930s. But Morgenthau planned that America, the greatest democracy on earth, should do this. However, it was leaked to the press and horrified American public opinion killed it.

\* \* \* \*

BUT how was Eisenhower, an American military officer if not a gentleman, able to bring about the deaths of a million German prisoners when he was bound by the Geneva Convention? Of these, says Mr. Bacque, at least 750,000 died from starvation and disease in American hands, while a large number, already semi-starved, were handed over to the French Army for "reparations labour" and were maltreated so appallingly that 250,000 soon died. Most were former Wehrmacht soldiers but "scores of thousands were women, children and old men". Whether the French or the U.S. Army killed them, Eisenhower was responsible for the policy. How was this possible when the United States had signed the Geneva Convention?

It was made possible on March 10th, 1945, says Mr. Bacque, when "a message signed and initialled by Eisenhower proposed a startling departure from the Geneva Convention, the creation of a new class of prisoners who would not be fed by the army after the surrender of Germany . . . Prisoners taken after VE Day would be called 'disarmed enemy forces', (DEF)". It is to the credit of the British and Canadians that they had nothing to do with this order.

Thus masses of German prisoners were penned inside cages, without food (though the Americans had plenty of food), without shelter (though the Americans had plenty of tents), and often without water. They lived in holes in the ground in atrocious weather throughout that summer of starvation. Local people were prevented from feeding them. Relief societies like the American Quakers had the food they sent to Germany returned. For Eisenhower hated Germans, though the smiling hypocrite said publicly he was feeding his prisoners. "At least ten times as many Germans died in the French and American camps as were killed in combat on the western front in north-west Europe from June 1941 to April 1945" says Mr. Bacque.

Martin Brech, an American soldier and prison guard at one of the "death camps" along the Rhine told the author: "I saw thousands of men crowded together, wet and cold, sleeping in the mud without shelter or blankets, eating grass because we fed them so little, dying . . .



It was made clear that our deliberate policy was not to feed them adequately . . . they were begging, getting sick and dying before us . . . gas would have been more merciful than our slow killing fields". But Eisenhower hated Germans.

How was this kept hidden so long? Mr. Bacque recounts how "the public was fooled, the International Committee of the Red Cross deceived, the press negated, the U.S. Senate neutered, books censored, archives destroyed and senior officials inveigled into the cover-up". A cover-up as complete as the long Soviet silence on the slaughter at Katyn Forest. Germans like Willy Brandt also played a part. The young Communist who fled Germany in 1933, renounced his country by becoming a Norwegian citizen, even taking a Norwegian name—a renegade in short—returned to Germany in 1945, became a German again, and on becoming Chancellor his Foreign Office subsidised books which denied atrocities in the U.S. camps.

Why did these things happen? They were the result of making the struggle with Germany a religious war. As General Fuller has written, "When war was declared the aim was proclaimed to be a moral one . . . Thus instead of the minds of the people being directed towards the re-establishment of the balance of power, their reason was obliterated by a spirit of hatred for the 'evil thing', and to them the war became a contest between Good and Evil . . . they came to believe that it was a sacred duty to kill their enemies in the most atrocious ways".

JOHN STEELE

## A SENSE OF ACTUALITY

**A European Diary**, Diana Mosley, with a Preface by  
Jasper Guinness, Typographeum, \$40.

FROM 1953 to 1959 Diana Mosley contributed "A Diary" to **The European** and in later years to **Action** and the **National European**. Her grandson Jasper Guinness has made his selection and written a preface (Diana Mosley has supplied an "Afterword") to this beautifully hand-set book, printed in America in an edition limited to 125 copies.

In his preface Mr. Guinness expresses his disagreement with Cyril Connolly's dictum "nothing dates like a sense of actuality" and the reader will agree that "these excerpts have lost none of their power to inform, amuse and annoy." In the days of **The European** it was my pleasant duty to type Lady Mosley's manuscripts and see them into print, and they read today as if I were seeing them for the first time.

How did the grandson make his choice from the mass of material at his disposal—and what would I choose as my favourite excerpt?



Would it be her fanciful picture of foreigners choosing England for their holidays, in order to gaze at our "wonderful" policemen? Or perhaps one of her more acid comments, such as the Russian authorities (in pre-Gorbachev days) "locking up writers in lunatic asylums" like "the Americans, who kept their poet, Ezra Pound, for many years in a madhouse in the most frightful conditions"? (I am sure she felt an affinity with the French boy who chose Napoleon as the greatest man of the 19th century because "he managed to annoy a good few people"). I share her dislike of the American import "as of now" when "now" is adequate. But my personal choice for pride of place in this gallery of literary talent must go to her description of the Billy Graham rally in the Velodrome d'Hiver which she attended. The American evangelist spoke no French, so a French pastor translated, sentence by sentence. I will spare the reader the literal French translation of each trite sentence and condense Lady Mosley's description of the scene:

"There was something unfairly comic about the proceeding. Mr. Graham . . . held out his hand with a book in it:

'You all know this book: it's the bible.'

The French pastor held out his hand with an identical book.

'You all know the bible is a good book.' "

In another excerpt Lady Mosley discusses the problem of disposing of old newspapers. "A periodic bonfire is the only solution; a very unsatisfactory one, since burnt newspaper transforms itself into a fine light, black confetti and floats all over the garden." Nothing Lady Mosley has written will ever suffer such a fate, but all will join this charming little book on the shelves of all discerning readers.

The book is available from the publishers of **Lodestar** at £20, including packing and postage. Please make your remittances payable to Sanctuary Press Ltd.

GEOFFREY VERNON

### **A BLACKSHIRT REMEMBERS**

**Blackshirts and Roses**, John Charnley, Brockingday Publications,  
£12.95

I RECENTLY embarked on the enormous task of researching so-called "histories", political biographies and autobiographies, for the most blatant distortions of the truth about Sir Oswald Mosley and his prewar British Union movement. It is refreshing to turn from such an occupation to read and review a remarkable book from "the other side of the hill."

John Charnley completed the writing of his autobiography shortly before his death and the manuscript has been edited into this account



of a journey from orphanage to Buckingham Palace (via Walton Prison and sundry wartime internment camps).

He was born in Leeds in 1909, the youngest of six children. His mother died before his second birthday and he was sent with his brothers and sisters to a Quaker orphanage in Leeds, where he remained until his father remarried (in 1919) and he entered the new family home in Blackburn. It is this crossing and re-crossing of the Pennines which gives the book the roses of its title.

In September 1933 John bought a copy of the British Union paper "The Blackshirt" from a street seller who turned out to be Tommy Moran, a former Royal Navy boxing champion. A visit to the local movement headquarters—and a new member was enrolled.

Read the book for a graphic account of the road on which the new recruit had embarked: it led him to active participation in all the main British Union meetings and marches, up to the author's arrest on June 3rd, 1940 under the infamous Defence Regulation 18B. Internment in Liverpool's Walton Prison and camps in the Isle of Man followed, until his release in November 1943.

The author admits that he was not so enthusiastic about Mosley's postwar Union Movement, in which he was less active, and much of the latter part of the book is devoted to his success in business and his National Chamber of Trade activities, crowned by his invitation to a Buckingham Palace garden party.

There are some small errors in the book. Our unwritten British Constitution does give the Monarch the right to appoint Ministers of his choice, but not to govern through them by royal decree. It was not Magna Carta which forbade imprisonment without trial, but the Petition of Rights of 1628 and the Habeas Corpus Act of 1679 (conveniently "suspended" in 1940). Again, John obviously loved the Latin of the Mass, but did not get it quite right: the Creed does not begin with "Credo in unam deum", but unum. (Not even the Second Vatican Council dared decree that God the Father should in future be feminine!) But these are minor blemishes and another Latin tag is applicable: *de mortuis nil nisi bonum*.

**Blackshirt and Roses** is available from Sanctuary Press at £13.80 (including packing and postage). It should be read in conjunction with four other books we can supply: Mosley's autobiography **My Life** (£8.95), Lady Mosley's **Loved Ones** (£6), my autobiography **Action Replay** (£8.95) and my **The Evil Good Men Do** (£9.95).

JEFFREY HAMM



## IN BRIEF

### THE WORK OF COLIN WILSON:

**An Annotated Bibliography & Guide. By Colin Stanley**  
(The Borgo Press £15.95)

FEW authors have achieved the literal overnight fame that Colin Wilson did in 1956 with his first book **The Outsider**. Taken up by the popular press, lionised in literary circles and, inevitably, his private life probed, he was forced to flee to Cornwall in order to be able to write at all. His second book, **Religion and the Rebel**, was universally damned by the critics who had praised the first and he was written off at the time as no more than the product of journalistic hype. However, he refused to be discouraged. Over 30 years and some 90 books later he is still living in Cornwall and still writing. His output has been prodigious and his books have covered subjects as diverse as philosophy, literary criticism, music, psychology, criminology, the occult and the paranormal as well as works of fiction. It provides a nightmare for any would-be bibliographer. Colin Stanley of Nottingham University Library has bravely tackled the task. In addition to giving an analytical table of contents for each of the books, he also provides comment on the subject-matter and on the book's place in the Wilson **oeuvre**. How he found the time to read them all defies the imagination. He has traced the main reviews which the books received and as well as the books has unearthed over 300 contributions to periodicals and a further 125 book reviews by Colin Wilson. There are also details of books and articles about the author and quotations from reviews of his main books.

In spite of the virtual impossibility of keeping up to date with Colin Wilson's colossal output the main bibliography is complete to 1988. The book concludes with an **Afterword** by Colin Wilson himself summing up his career and his motivation. An indispensable work of reference, this book is a must for all who are interested in Colin Wilson or, indeed, in post-war English writing.

(Borgo Press books are distributed in Britain by Pauper's Press, 27 Melbourne Road, West Bridgford, Nottingham NG2 5DJ).

\* \* \* \*

### AN ESSAY ON THE MEANING OF ENGLISH NATIONHOOD

By Stuart Millson

THERE are, to simplify slightly, two basic concepts of the state. On the first view society is simply a collection of individual citizens and the state exists to regulate their individual activities and appetites only to ensure that these do not impinge too much on other citizens. The other view is that society is a living organism, a product of history



and a partnership between the past, the present and the future. On the first view there is no need for citizens of a state to have anything in common other than an interest in such prosperity and security of that state as will guarantee their own prosperity and security. Those who hold the second view require a bond which transcends simple interest, one which provides a link based on shared history, culture and kinship. Stuart Millson clearly belongs to the second category.

Edmund Burke notwithstanding, the organic tradition of politics was never strong in this country. The spirit of liberalism, the theory of society as no more than a contract, permeated the ideas of all political parties. Moreover, the British, and above all the English, confident in their supposed natural superiority, did not bother to think too much about national identity. Since the war the loss of empire, the continuing Americanisation of our culture and our way of life and large-scale immigration have almost completed the destruction of this country's sense of identity and role in the world, leaving the majority indifferent to their heritage and the remainder insecure and fearful for its future. It is this situation which Stuart Millson has addressed in an attempt to restore a sense of distinctive Englishness to his fellow countrymen. If I understand him correctly Mr. Millson is not proposing English separatism or the break up of the unity of Great Britain. As an Englishman he conceives his nationality through his Englishness, just as for example a Scot would through his Scottishness. It is not necessarily a denial of wider loyalty. His thoughtful essay should strike a chord even among those committed to forms of European political organisation to which he himself is hostile. (See his interesting article on **The Path to Europe** in **Lodestar** no. 16). After all, we are only Europeans in so far as we are, in the first instance, English, Scots, Welsh, French, German, Italian, etc.

(**An Essay on the Meaning of English Nationhood** is available from the author, 30p plus postage, at 109 Durham Road, Shortlands, Bromley, Kent).

\* \* \* \*

**An apology.** In the review in our last issue of Lois Lamplugh's book **A Shadowed Man: Henry Williamson, 1895-1977** both the ISBN No. and the address of the publisher were misprinted. This was especially unfortunate since the book is an excellent study of Henry Williamson and should be of interest to all interested in the man and his writings. The correct ISBN No. is: 0 95153470 X.

The address of the publisher is: Wellspring,  
Springside,  
Bydown,  
Swimbridge,  
Devon EX32 0QB

Our apologies to the author.

P.J.W.



## LETTER

### THE PATH TO EUROPE

Sir —

Stuart Millson's sensitive article on Englishness in Europe deserves comment from like minds who seek a different political and economic outcome.

English patriotism has been denigrated and attacked for years. Its revival and the reassertion of national confidence must precede any constructive part in which our people, along with our Welsh and Scottish companions, can play in European development. We need the **combination** of all the diverse national sentiments across the common continent, not their diminution or conflict with one another. **None** of us should ever feel smothered by a "foreign" majority or incur the slightest further damage to our individual tradition, but we do need to unite so that we can all again have a decisive impact upon future world history. This balance is difficult for our particular country, but the picture can be clarified with a few thoughts.

During the recent regrettably **under-played** Battle of Britain celebrations, I was among those who felt the catch in the throat as memories were evoked by the chugging sound and monochrome sight of the Spitfire piloted in Kentish skies, and the history and poetry of this "blessed plot . . . set in a silver sea" returned to heart and mind. Yet this sentiment is perfectly consistent with the knowledge of the damage done to our country and to our entire civilisation by two Anglo-German wars, an admiration for Teutonic achievements in music and scholarship, and a realisation that our "island race" and the Germans, many centuries earlier, were largely the same people. Much as I acknowledge the virtues of Islam or the genial loyalism of many West Indians, I do not feel in the least "foreign" among the Germans or the French, whereas this sadly is not the case when travelling around the new "ethnic communities" resident in our ancient cities. And it is not a matter of "pigmentation".

What is it about the character of our English villages, market towns and cathedral cities that makes one feel a national patriotism? They are distinctive, of course, but paradoxically much of their appeal lies in their very European character dating back further than Nelson or Drake to a time when Europeans shared a single faith, while branching out with the languages that derive from the "Aryan" original. Lagos and Delhi, Peking and even Los Angeles, do not feel "ours". With York and Salisbury, Triers and Rouen, there is a sense of belonging. Our "island story"—banned from school libraries by the leftwing censors of "multiracialism"—was one of Britons, Romans, Saxons, Danes and Norman French, a European history.

Our family of peoples made a civilisation still faced with internal and external dangers, whatever the truth about Gorbachev and the American banks that keep him afloat. Differences between Nordic and



Mediterranean, or Celt and Slav, have become as irrelevant as the denominational dissensions among Christians. We all face problems of population overspill from the "decolonised" third-world, rampant materialism, the egalitarian ideology that accompanies decadence, and runaway technology that can split atoms and splice genes with horrendous social consequences. Readers should peruse the neo-Spenglerian accounts in such studies as **Apocalypse 2000** by Peter Jay and Michael Stewart and **Shall We Make the Year 2000?** by J. G. de Beus.

England must re-adapt its politics, along with its immediate neighbours and former "dominions", precisely in order to preserve its essential character, and to recover effective control over "our own affairs". This entails sovereignty over changes inside British boundaries and co-operation, with others likewise threatened by international forces, over external supplies and meeting hostile threats. We should join the French and Germans against redefinition of our homelands as "multicultural societies" re-opened for Afro-Asian immigration on a scale unprecedented since the Mongol and Saracen hordes. Ideological nonsense, unscientific sloganising and psychological terror used by the so-called "antiracists" must be intellectually defeated and politically superseded.

A half-way house between the old Europe of Nations and a new Nation of Europe, however, will bring the worst of both worlds. Elected European government should be concerned almost entirely with defence of this geostrategic region, and with credit-control and trade-agreements to secure self-sufficiency and a balance between production and consumption, but little more. (The Member for Finchley must not return from the Gulf to renew hostilities across the Rhine, by the way). If compulsory multiculturalism can be overcome, and British patriotism and competence revived, we might, even yet, feel sufficiently on top of events again to contribute peacefully and constructively to European development; a role for Charles III.

"The real Europe has existed for three thousand years, and these shifting barricades which separate us are of more recent and man-made origin. If it had not been for that little muddle after the death of Charlemagne, a united Europe might have been strong enough to prevent the neighbouring island grabbing most of the world. As it is, English experience may now be of some assistance in helping Europe (of which we are a part despite every crime and folly of our present rulers) to preserve nearly everything which still matters in the world . . . Let us not think even in terms of 1914, 1939, or of the nineteenth century; let us dare even to think biologically . . . Much as we love our countries we shall grow to realise that the proudest words spoken on earth since **Civis Romanus sum** will be 'I am a European'."

Yours faithfully,

LINDSAY KENT, London

Editor's note: The quotation which concludes the letter is from an article by Sir Oswald Mosley, published in **The European** in June 1954 in reply to Dr. Otto Strasser's "The Role of Europe" in the same issue.



## **LODESTAR**

Published Quarterly

Single copies: £1.20 post free      Subscriptions (4 issues): £5.00

Cheques payable to: Sanctuary Press Ltd.,  
Nash House,  
Fishponds Road,  
London SW17

Copies of issues 2-16 inclusive still available £1.20

### **Contents include:**

**No. 4**

**COLIN WILSON on The Criminal Mind of Karl Marx**

**No. 6**

**JEFFREY HAMM on "Fascism in Britain" and**

**RICHARD THURLOW's reply**

**No. 7**

**COLIN WILSON on The Decline and Fall of Leftism**

**No. 8**

**COLIN WILSON on The Socialism of Jack London**

**No. 9**

**GENERAL SIR WALTER WALKER, KCB, CBE, DSO on  
Soviet Global Expansion and Strategy**

**COLIN WILSON on Harry Ritchie's "Success Stories"**

**No. 10**

**DIANA MOSLEY on South Africa**

**No. 11**

**COLIN WILSON on The Evil Good Men Do**

**PETER WALLIS on Colin Wilson: A Celebration**

**No. 13**

**ROBERT SAUNDERS on Not So Much Green As Cabbage  
Lookin'**

**No. 14**

**COLIN STANLEY on The Reluctant Librarian**

**PETER WALLIS on Lady Eve Balfour**

**No. 15**

**Tributes to Diana Mosley at Eighty**

**No. 16**

**STUART MILLSON on The Path to Europe**

**SIR OSWALD MOSLEY on The Doctrine of Higher Forms**



